Serial No.: 09/472,134

Art Unit: 3611

Examiner: BOEHLER, Anne Marie M.

Response to Office Action July 2, 2010

Page 19 of 20

REMARKS

By the present amendment, the claims 1, 6, 10, 16, 20, 26, 30, 36, 40, 44, 45, 46, 77,

81, 82, 84, and 90 have been amended. Claims 50-76, 85, 86, 89, 91 and 92 were previously

cancelled. Claims 1-49, 77-84, 87, 88 and 90 remain pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested in view of the following

remarks.

Upon review of the present case and that of child case serial no. 10/294,892,

applicants have realized that the claims are not in condition for appeal, as it appears that the

art and issues raised in the child case may not have been fully considered by the examiner in

this case. Applicants regret this oversight as it was not the fault of the examiner.

Applicants specifically bring to the examiner's attention her rejections in the '892

application and, in order to have all of the issues in the present case in front of the Board on

appeal, request that, to the extent she has not already done so, if she considers it appropriate,

she make any rejections of the claims similar in nature to those she has made in the '892

application, in the present application. (Applicants do not want the prosecution in the

present case reopened yet again after a second decision by the Board.

While most of the art cited by the examiner in the '892 has at one time or another

been cited by the applicants in an IDS, some has not. The applicants are thus filing a

supplemental IDS herewith. Given the long pendency of the present application, and that of

the '892 application, and in view of the fact that examiner was not the original examiner of

the '892 application, examiner is requested to review all of the prior art of record in both

cases to the extent that she is not familiar therewith.

In order to assist the examiner, further the prosecution of the present case and

consolidate issues on appeal, in view of the rejections and amendments in the '892 case, the

applicants are amending all of the independent claims of the present application to now recite

that the tunnel is formed from bent sheet metal as opposed to merely including a piece of bent

sheet metal, as was done in the '892 case.

MONTREAL:2881083.1

Serial No.: 09/472,134

Art Unit: 3611

Examiner: BOEHLER, Anne Marie M.

Response to Office Action July 2, 2010

Page 20 of 20

At the time of filing of the present response, the Office was authorized to charge the

fees believed to be necessary to a credit card. In case of any under- or over-payment or

should any additional fee be otherwise necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to credit or

debit (as the case may be) Deposit Account number 502977.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Jonathan D. Cutler /

Jonathan D. Cutler, Reg. No. 40,576

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP

Attorneys for the Applicants

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP

1000 de la Gauchetière St. West

**Suite 2100** 

Montréal, Québec H3B 4W5

Canada

Tel. (514) 904-8100

Fax. (514) 904-8101

MONTREAL:2881083.1 216853